

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

MAY 15 2008

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the rejections of claims 7 and 8 is respectfully requested.


Claim 7 calls for attaching ligands to provide a reducing agent property and claim 8 calls for attaching ligands to provide an oxidizing property. These claims were rejected only under the cited Andros patent. The basis for the rejection seems to be that "the cationic ligand is necessarily providing one of the three properties -- inert, reducing, or oxidizing, depending on the medium and the chemical species in question -- it may be any of the three and is not independent of the cleaning solution and particles and contaminants contained therein."

The fact that anything is possible or anything could be used does not teach using the specific element claimed. Nothing in the cited reference teaches either the elements set forth in claims 7 or 8 or both of them. The fact that lots of things are a possibility (even though not taught by the reference) are of no moment. Reconsideration would be appropriate.

On the same basis, reconsideration of the rejections of claims 17 and 18 is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: May 15, 2008



Timothy N. Trop, Reg. No. 28,994
TROP, PRUNER & HU, P.C.
1616 South Voss Road, Suite 750
Houston, TX 77057-2631
713/468-8880 [Phone]
713/468-8883 [Fax]

Attorneys for Intel Corporation